

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 93 12:04:51 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #52
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 12 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 52

Today's Topics:

 1200Mhz is not a microwave band!
 900 Mhz cordless - AT&T news release
 Boatanchors of old (2 msgs)
 F3C Radio-FAX with atariST?
 License Delays
 Nashville on 2-meters
 New Licensees: When did you test?
News of a DXpedition to the Laccadives as reported by Sangu,VU2SF
 Standard C558 dual bauder
 STS-54 Element Set (013.62)
 WANTED: HAWAII!!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1993 17:07:01 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!news.nd.edu!mentor.cc.purdue.edu!
npirs!dheisler@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1200Mhz is not a microwave band!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>
> Band Designations
> -----
>
> 0 Hz- 20 KHz --- Audio
>

> Any questions?
> --scott

yeah i do actually, why do they call the above band audio?

Am i supposed to correlate EM waves with sound waves? Why
not low freq. EM?

dave

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 93 18:35:45 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 900 Mhz cordless - AT&T news release
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I picked this up from a post to alt.scanner

In article <1993Jan12.155103.16454@cis.ohio-state.edu> bonk@elm.cis.ohio-state.edu
(gregory j bonk) writes:

>I was sent this from a broadcast to AT&T employees.

> Thought you might be interested.....

>

> *** AT&T today announced a high-power, all-digital cordless phone
> with four times the range of today's conventional cordless
> telephones. The AT&T Extended Range Cordless Telephone 9530
> operates in the 900-MHz frequency, providing virtually
> interference-free conversations with consistent sound quality up
> to one mile from the base. The AT&T 9530 uses full digital
> transmission to encode speech onto a radio signal, much like music
> is encoded onto a CD, and to provide clearer sound over a longer
> range than cordless phones operating in the 46/49-MHz frequency.
> AT&T's spread-spectrum, frequency-hopping architecture, which is
> patent-pending, actually avoids interference by "hopping" the
> radio signal among 50 of the available 173 channels during a
> conversation. If any of the channels experience interference, the
> 9530 automatically swaps it for a new, clearer channel. Because
> it operates over a different frequency, the AT&T 9530 is
> unaffected by forms of interference common to 46/49-MHz cordless
> phones, such as garage door openers, baby monitors and radio
> intercoms. It also performs well in environments typically
> difficult for conventional cordless, such as high-rise apartment
> and multilevel buildings. The random selection of 50 of 173
> channels, along with digital speech encoding, makes it nearly
> impossible to eavesdrop on conversations. The AT&T 9530 was
> designed and developed by AT&T Bell Laboratories, employing
> advanced integrated circuit technology developed jointly with AT&T

> Microelectronics. The AT&T Extended Range Cordless Telephone 9530
> will be available in late spring at AT&T Phone Centers nationwide
> for \$449.99. For more information, call 800-222-3111.
>

Date: 12 Jan 93 17:35:32 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Boatanchors of old
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Subj: Boatanchors of old

Here's something that ought to bring back memories for the OF on the net:

I just obtained a FB copy of a 1957 Heathkit catalog. Among other items listed is a DX-20 (\$35.95), DX-35 (\$56.95), and DX-100 (\$189.50). you could also get the VF-1 VFO for \$19.50 and the AR-3 receiver for \$30.75.

Those old specs weren't bad, either. The -20 boasted 50 watts from a 6DQ6A, the -35 ran 65 watts from a 6146, and the -100 claimed 140 watts (CW) from a pair of 6146s. For the newer Hams, these were straight transmitters. You had to have a separate receiver.

Here are the advertising bullets for the -100:

- o Phone or CW on 160,80,40,20,15,11,and 10 meters.
- o Built-in VFO, modulator, and power supplies.
- o Kit includes all parts-tubes-hardware-cabinet, etc.
- o Coils are pre-wound and cables pre-harnessed.
- o High-quality components used throughout for reliable performance.
- o Features 5-point TVI suppression.
- o Easy to build from complete instructions and pictorial diagrams enclosed.

Don't you just wish they still offered a kit like this?

Naaaah! No bells and whistles! And ya gotta know how to tune the finals!

73,
Dube Todd AB5AP <dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com>

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1993 18:21:30 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!bogus.sura.net!darwin.sura.net!gatech!destroyer!
lambda.msfc.nasa.gov!troll11!rich@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Boatanchors of old
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article AA07798@tilde.csc.ti.com, dube@cpdvax.CSc.ti.COM () writes:

>
>Subj: Boatanchors of old
>Those old specs weren't bad, either. The -20 boasted 50 watts from a
>6DQ6A, the -35 ran 65 watts from a 6146, and the -100 claimed 140 watts
>(CW) from a pair of 6146s. For the newer Hams, these were straight
>transmitters. You had to have a separate receiver.
>

My old DX-100 would crank out about 185, continuous key-down--sure
wish I still had that beast. I think it weighed about 1 pound per watt, too!

>Here are the advertising bullets for the -100:
> o Phone or CW on 160,80,40,20,15,11,and 10 meters.
> o Built-in VFO, modulator, and power supplies.
> o Kit includes all parts-tubes-hardware-cabinet, etc.
> o Coils are pre-wound and cables pre-harnessed.
> o High-quality components used throughout for reliable performance.
> o Features 5-point TVI suppression.
> o Easy to build from complete instructions and pictorial diagrams
> enclosed.
>
>Don't you just wish they still offered a kit like this?
>Naaaah! No bells and whistles! And ya gotta know how to tune the finals!
>
Hey, bring the old beasts on, I still can tune finals--

Rich, working on getting back into Hamming--last on the air in the '60's

"My opinions are my own, and my employer (Boeing Computer Support Services)
denies any responsibility for me, all opinions in general, and anything
I may say, do, or be otherwise associated with outside of work for them.
-- Use at your own risk, your mileage may vary, no news is good news."

E-MAIL REPLY TO: rich@troll1.msfc.nasa.gov PLEASE KEEP IT "G" RATED

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1993 17:54:22 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!torn!nott!cu23.crl.aecl.ca!
cc4.crl.aecl.ca!camerond@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: F3C Radio-FAX with atariST?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

There was a WEFAX program and interface published years ago in ANTIC magazine. I have found nothing since. JVFAX50 for the msdos machines is available at many ftp sites. It is much more sophisticated, can use a simple interface, and better interfaces, built or in kit form, are available at several places in Germany.

I have not yet used either program, but have received good reports on the JVFAX program

Don Cameron VE3NVU

Date: 12 Jan 1993 11:55:29 -0600
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: License Delays
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Read the *whole* post please....

----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Sun, 10 Jan 1993 11:30:52 +0600 (CST)
From: Peter Laws <plaws@uafhp.uark.edu>
To: "mail --> news" <rec-radio-amateur-misc@cs.utexas.edu>
Subject: License Delays

>Ya know, maybe if we paid more than \$0.56/yr for our licenses...

>BUT WAIT!

>The FCC doesn't even get that!!!!!!! That goes to the _volunteer_ examiners. The _paid_ FCC gets NOTHING. Nothing but headaches from WHINY

^^^|^^^ ^^^^^^---^^^^^^^I stand by this....

^ What does this say? *SO* many people hit the flame-key before re-reading....

>hams.

>It's a wonder we get any allocations.

>Here's to a \$50, 10 year ticket...

>Peter

Green is right. Ask hams to even pay a *fraction* of what their license is worth and see the fur fly!!

Peter...

Date: 12 Jan 93 18:49:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Nashville on 2-meters
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #49
> Message-id: <9301120504.AA16525@ucsd.edu>

> Date: 11 Jan 93 13:35:11 CST
> From:
> swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!ukma!netnews.louisville.edu
> !w
> kuvx1!kallits@network.UCSD.EDU
> Subject: Nashville 2-meter frequencies
> To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> I am interested in finding 2-meter repeater and packet frequencies
> for the Nashville, TN or central TN area. Any help would be
> greatly appreciated.

> Tim Kallio
>

In the Nashville area, 2-meters is highly changeable. I'll try to
give it my best shot:

Repeater known to be friendly:
147.015, 146.91, 146.88, 145.47
also 145.37, 147.18 if up.

(I'm sure I left some out, but ...)

The rest vary from: up, dead, unknown, or in some cases under
a peculiar form of "private" status, where passerby are allowed
to talk there if they say things the owner likes to hear, but
only selected locals will be found/allowed. The ARRL Guide will
give some additional frequencies. Conditions change often, so
take your best shot.

There is also some simplex activity such as 146.49, and 146.52,
and ATVer's on 144.34, all pretty friendly.

The packet scene has BBS's on 144.99, 145.61 and .67.
Also the DX cluster is on 145.75, ROSE has been on 145.03/05/07.

You didn't ask, but I will add that the 222mhz band listings
in the Guide are generally up to date with all open machines,
except for 224.08, which is apparently closed and/or dead by
now. Packet is scarce on this band, but check 223.60-.80 .

Hope this helps, have a good time.

de Curt N4MEY@W4HHY.TN.USA.NA
PORTER04@TSU.BITNET

CAUTION

CUTE DISCLAIMER FOLLOWS

"These are NOT opinions. They are hallucinations."

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1993 18:05:14 GMT
From: shearson.com!jenny!mjohnsto@uunet.uu.net
Subject: New Licensees: When did you test?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Okay, I'm getting antsy and it has been only 6 weeks since I tested for my Tech license. I know the FCC is saying 90-120 days for new hams, but I'm hoping this is a worst case scenario. Knowing the way the government estimates things (like deficits) this is probably way off.

Some of you must have recently received your ticket. If so, when did you receive it and when did you test?

Thank.

MJ

--

Michael R. Johnston, System Administrator mjohnsto@shearson.com
"The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore, all progress depends on the unreasonable man." - G.B. Shaw

Date: 12 Jan 93 17:58:04 UT
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: News of a DXpedition to the Laccadives as reported by Sangu,VU2SF
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

News of a DXpedition to the Laccadives as reported by Sangu,VU2SF
to Raj,VU2ZAP and Lucky,VU2LBW, sysops at BBS VU2RSB:

Dr.Sangunni states that the DXpedition from Bangalore to Laccadives will be QRV on the Bands on the 13th January 1993 at approximately 1400 UTC. They expect to operate 7 - 10 days.

The Members of the DXpedition will be operating on 40,20,15 and 10m as:

VU7SF - Dr.Sangunni, VU7API - Palani, VU7LZ - Tom

They will be assisted by VU2DEN - Gopal

They plan to operate on the following frequencies (KHz) on SSB:

| Tx | Rx |
|--------|-----------------|
| 7,090 | - 7,160 for USA |
| 14,195 | - 10 up |
| 21,200 | - 10 up |
| 28,500 | - 10 up |

On CW all bands 005 Khz listening 5 up.

QSL to: P.O.BOX 41366, Nashville, TN 37204, U.S.A

Good Luck and good hunting!

-- Lucky, VU2LBW
lucky@ece.iisc.ernet.in

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1993 17:24:12 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!hp9000.csc.cuhk.hk!uxmail!ee_hflo@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Standard C558 dual bauder
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Anyone are using Standard C558 dual bauder ? Please tell me the feature about this radio. I am going to buy a dual bauder.

| Lo Ho Fung Michael Comp 'N' | == Internet e-mail address == |
| Department of | University : ee_hflo@stu.ust.hk |
| Electrical & Electronic Engineering | Oversea BBS : mlo@nyx.cs.du.edu |
| The Hong Kong University | Local BBS : michaelo@gnct.com |
| of Science & Technology | Radio Call Sign : VR2YJR |

Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1993 18:15:17 GMT
From: telesoft!garym@uunet.uu.net

Subject: STS-54 Element Set (013.62)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Here is a set of prelaunch elements for STS-54 from JSC. These are for a ontime launch at 1352 UTC on January 13 and assume a nominal ascent and entry. Thanks to Gil Carmen and Lou McFadin at JSC.

--GaryM

```

STS-54
1 00054U          A 93013.62833934 .00025000 00000-0 25599-3 0      17
2 00054 28.4694 152.6201 0003379 302.6575 57.3688 15.90451125      23

```

```

Satellite: STS-54
Catalog number: 00054
Epoch time:      93013.62833934 =====> (13 JAN 93    15:04:48.51 UTC)
Element set:      JSC-001
Inclination:      28.4694 deg
RA of node:       152.6201 deg
Eccentricity:     .0003379
Arg of perigee:   302.6575 deg
Mean anomaly:     57.3688 deg
Mean motion:      15.90451125 rev/day
Decay rate:       2.5000e-04 rev/day*2
Epoch rev:       2

```

--
Gary Morris KK6YB Internet: elements-request@telesoft.com
San Diego, CA, USA Phone: +1 619-457-2700

Date: 12 Jan 93 18:43:16 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!oswego!
oswego.Oswego.edu!kinne@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: WANTED: HAWAII!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Folks:

Good morning... I have been working on my Worked All States award for some time now. I have gotten to the point where I need to contact and confirm only ONE MORE STATE: the elusive HAWAII! My "hurry" is that I may be moving in a few weeks and if I cannot get HI by that time, I will, of course, have to start all over again.

Are there any HI stations on the Net who would like the help me? I would really appreciate it! After three years of working on this (on and off til this possible move put the fire into me) I find it amazing that I only have one more state to find. My worry is that I have never

heard HI on the air and I wonder how much of that is due to the location of my station. I'm able to put about 150 watts into a G5RV layed on the roof of a 3rd floor, 175 year old building (great for history, rotten for radio since the phone lines where layed before Bell was born and the building's electrical system doesn't know the meaning of the word "ground.").

If there are any HI stations on the Net who would like to be directly responsible (via the LAST needed contact) for a fellow operator finally getting his WAS before he moves, PLEASE contact me via return email so we can talk about setting up a sked. N2IKR can operate on SSB, CW, and RTTY. I'd PREFER the contact be SSB because I have far more experience in that than the other two, but I am very willing to experiment!

I would greatly appreciate any help the Net could give me!
HAWAII, where are you? 8-)

73!
Doc Kinne, N2IKR
kinnerc@snymorva.bitnet

Date: 12 Jan 93 09:59:03 CST
From: timbuk.cray.com!walter.cray.com!ferrari!jwl@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan8.195536.18303@venus.ic.cmc.ca>,
<1993Jan9.141959.17257@ke4zv.uucp>, <1is80mINNb0r@clover.csv.warwick.ac.uk>ter.
Reply-To : jwl@ferrari.cray.com (Jim Lynch)
Subject : Re: intermod, overload, desense?

In article <1is80mINNb0r@clover.csv.warwick.ac.uk>, esrlb@csv.warwick.ac.uk (Mr S Browne) writes:

>In article <1993Jan9.141959.17257@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>

>[.....]

>

>>If you want to build a notch filter, install a Tee in your
>>antenna feedline, attach the feedline to an FM broadcast
>>receiver, and attach a length of coax to the odd leg that
>>is slightly more than a quarterwave at the offending

>

^^^^^^^^^^^^

>>station's frequency. Short this cable at it's free end.

>

^^^^

>>

>>Ant-----T-----radio

>> |
>> |
>> short

>

>Seems to me that it's an open-circuited quarter wave stub that's needed.
>In the diagram above, the short would be transformed by the quarter wave
>section to look like an open circuit at the tee, and therefore little
>effect at the frequency it's cut for would result. If it was open circuit
>at the far end, it would transform to a short at the tee end, however.
>If it were a half wave in length, you'd want it to be shorted.
>Velocity factor of the cable needs to be taken into account, of course.

>

>>Gary

>

>Simon Browne (GOGWA)
>Engineering Dept
>Warwick University, UK

Would either of you two gentleman care to discuss the characteristics of this filter? Like what are the bandpass (bandreject?) characteristics? How would you calculate them? The books discuss l/c filters and active filters, but is there a simple way to determine the characteristics of a stub?

Thanks, Jim.

--

Jim Lynch, Sales Analyst, Cray Research, Inc. / ARS: K4GV0
Southeast District, Phone: (404) 631-2254, Email: jwl@sedist.cray.com
Suite 270, 200 Westpark Drive, Peachtree City, GA 30269

Date: 12 Jan 93 10:32:27 CST
From: timbuk.cray.com!walter.cray.com!ferrari!jwl@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C0K6D4.o0@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>,
<1993Jan11.101849.25363@walter.cray.com>, <1993Jan11.175448.5544@CSD-
NewsHost.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : jwl@ferrari.cray.com (Jim Lynch)
Subject : Re: Anybody want to talk about Clover?

In article <1993Jan11.175448.5544@CSD-NewsHost.Stanford.EDU>,
paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>In article <1993Jan11.101849.25363@walter.cray.com> jwl@ferrari.cray.com (Jim

Lynch) writes:

>>We need a "public domain" system to be distributed to multiple vendors, like
>>TAPR has done. That is probably the only way we will be able to have reasonable
>>prices on advanced communications modes. As long as the modes remain
>>proprietary, they will be expensive. Anyone care to form a committee to design
>>such an advanced mode?

>

>Frankly, \$1000 for the HAL CLOVER board is a good deal. The amount of DSP
>hardware on the board is impressive to say the least. The CLOVER software is,
>however, untrivial. Aside from all of the adaptive filters and modems,
>CLOVER makes extensive use of fast spectral Reed - Solomon coding systems,
>which are not much fun to write, I'm afraid. Even when HAL does formally
>release a protocol spec, don't count on cheap knockoffs anytime soon.

>

>--

>--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "My boy, we are pilgrims in an unholy land."

>->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Dr. Henry Jones Sr.

I don't want this to turn into a flamfest, but let me point out a couple of
"facts".

\$1000 for a board comprised of fiber, plastic and silicon, isn't necessarily a
good deal.

Now, there are a group of folks that hang around this net who have written and
maintain
a very respectable Unix clone, Linux. Somehow I gotta think that there were LOTS
more
man hours that went into developing that software than HAL's clover board.
Granted,
it took a special expertise to develop DSP modems, Reed- Solomon coding systems
etc., but
developing a Unix-like kernel isn't a cakewalk for 6th graders either. I see I
didn't
mention that Linux is free for the asking.

Now I understand that HAL has spent a bunch of money to develop the CLOVER board
and
they are entitled to ask whatever they want for their product to recoup their
costs
and make a buck to boot. I don't doubt that they have a fine product.

I won't accept the belief that:

- 1) That is the only mode of communication that will provide reasonable thruput on HF.
- 2) No one else could come up with hardware/software to do a similar or better job

for less money.

Maybe a cheap knockout isn't what the world needs. Maybe the better mousetrap isn't it. Maybe we replace the mousetrap with something else.

Bottom line:

I think that there is the necessary talent hanging around to come up with a decent design. Hams aren't suppose to get rich from their hobby. Helping each other is a way of life for us. We could do it if we wanted to. I can't, I'm too stupid. But there are folks reading this that can.

enuff...

de Jim.

--

Jim Lynch, Sales Analyst, Cray Research, Inc. / ARS: K4GVO
Southeast District, Phone: (404) 631-2254, Email: jwl@sedist.cray.com
Suite 270, 200 Westpark Drive, Peachtree City, GA 30269

Date: 12 Jan 1993 17:19:45 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1052@vk2bea.UUCP>, <1993Jan12.134250.5062@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1iupd8INNor9@rave.larc.nasa.gov>p
Subject : Re: 1200Mhz is not a microwave band!

In article <1iupd8INNor9@rave.larc.nasa.gov> kludge@grissom.larc.nasa.gov (Scott Dorsey) writes:

>Band Designations

>-----

> 0 Hz- 20 KHz --- Audio
> 20KHz- 540KHz --- VLF
>540KHz- 30MHz --- Radio
> 30MHz- up --- Voodoo

Naw...you're incomplete:

0 Hz- 20KHz: audio
20KHz- 540KHz: VLF

540KHz- 30MHz: slow waves
30MHz- 512MHz: radio
512MHz-1300MHz: nosebleed
1300MHz- 10GHz: voodoo
10GHz- 300GHz: pixie dust and mirrors
300GHz up: daylight

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, _The Sum of All Fears_

Date: 12 Jan 1993 15:51:04 GMT

From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!

news.larc.nasa.gov!grissom.larc.nasa.gov!kludge@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9301051454.AA02438@tix.timeplex.com>, <1052@vk2bea.UUCP>,
<1993Jan12.134250.5062@ke4zv.uucp>gov

Subject : Re: 1200Mhz is not a microwave band!

In article <1993Jan12.134250.5062@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>In article <1052@vk2bea.UUCP> michael@vk2bea.UUCP (Michael G. Katzmann) writes:

>>In article <9301051454.AA02438@tix.timeplex.com> taylor@tix.timeplex.COM (Seth
Taylor) writes:

>>>Since so called "microwave ovens" operate in the UHF designation

>>>frequency range why don't we call them a "UHF" ? Think about that

>>>one.

>>

>>Eh? 2450 MHz sounds like S-band microwave to me!

>

>Ah, but the ARRL still clings to the 1947 Atlantic City nomenclature

>which says anything between 300-3000 Megacycles is UHF. The CCIR doesn't

>consider that correct nomenclature anymore, but so it goes. S band microwave

>is an even older nomenclature used by the military. It's not acceptable

>either. The CCIR says they should be called "band 6" or "hectometric"

>waves, or the really preferred nomenclature is to simply spell out the

>Megahertz frequency span.

Band Designations

0 Hz- 20 KHz --- Audio

20KHz- 540KHz --- VLF

540KHz- 30MHz --- Radio
30MHz- up --- Voodoo

Any questions?
--scott

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #52
